Madurai Dist Records

8980
———
30410

8850

160

மதுரை மாவட்ட ஆட்சிதுறை

8980

~~3010~~

30110

List of Retainable pa[illegible]

Received Letters Court of Wards

Date.	Number.	From whom received.	
[illegible]	..	Secretary	Communicating the approval of the Cour[illegible] the Collector in searching the Ramnad papers [illegible] house for private papers, as such is ultra vires.
[illegible]	..	Ag. Chief Secy to Govt.	Papers relating to the administration of the Ramnad Zemindary.
[illegible]	..	Secretary to the Board of Revenue	Communicating the opinion that the manager of property under the Court of Wards need not be of the family or caste with the minor, & the appointment of manager is left to the option of the Court of Wards.

D வ[illegible]

செப்பனிடுவதற்காக எடுத்துக் கொள்ளப்பட்ட

[illegible] மாதம் 1984 வருடம்

செப்பனிட்டு முடித்த

[illegible] மாதம் 1984 வருடம்

[illegible]

ஆராய்ச்சி உதவியாளரின் கையொப்பம்.

List of Retainable pape[rs] [illegible]

Received Letters *Court of Wards* [illegible]

	Number.	From whom received.	
3	..	Secretary to the Bd of Revenue	Communicating [illegible] of the Court of Wards on [illegible] Moyeen Jafthah [illegible] of Serv[ice] for the Ramnaad Zemin[dary]
43	..	Ranee Parvathany Natchiar mother [illegible] [the] minor of [the] Ramnad Zemindary	Petition in reference mainly to a suit inst[itut]ed against her by Muthu Viraye Natchiar for the Zemindary of Ramnad
13	..	Ag Secretary to the Board of Revenue	Communicating Bd's opinion that Mootoo Chella Tevar the ex-manager of the Ramnaad Zemindary should be restored possession of the little palace at Ramnaad if it be found that he resided there as a member of the family
[illegible]	..	Do	Communicating the opinion of the Court of Wards that the removal of [illegible] in Zemindaries can be effected only by instituting a suit in the Civil Court.

List of Retainable papers for 1845-46

Received Letters *Court of Wards* Madura Collector's Office.

Date.	Number.	From whom received.	Substance.
1845	..	Acting Secretary to the Board of Revenue	With reference to the question of Collector's power under Reg IV of 1822 to dismiss Curnums in a Zemindary under Wardship, informing the opinion of the Sudder Adalut that a Curnum of a village whose revenue has been permanently fixed, cannot be removed except by an institution of a civil suit
..	..	Chief Secretary	Forwarding copy of an extract from the Proceedings of the Sudder Adalut under date 2/9/1830, relating to the right of Zemindars & Collectors, of dismissing Curnums.
	..	Acting Secretary	Papers relating to the administration of the Ramnaad Zemindary
		Ag Sy to the Board of Revenue	Soliciting information on the claim of Ragoonada [illegible] chetty [illegible] to the [illegible] place at Ramnaad.

4

List of Retainable papers for 1845 -46

Received Letters Court of Wards Madura Collector's Office

Date.	Number.	From whom received.	Substance.
/8/45	do	Sy. to the Board of Revenue	Correspondence relating to the alienation of the two Ani villages of Sirovayal and Kelapaniyur apper-taining to the Ramnaad Zemy.
/6/45	..	Secy. to Govt	Communicating Govt order that Mootoo chella Taver should establish his claim to the "Little Palace at Ram-naad", before a civil Court of la[w]
30/6/45	..	Secy to the Board of Rev	Correspondence relating to the levy of the tax on Areca in the island of Ramesweram and in Pamben.
14/7/45	446	do	Correspondence relating to the suit No. 3 of 1843 on the file of the civil court, brought by Moottoo Viriayi Natchiar claiming the Zemindary of Ramnaad.
8/9/45	175	Secretary	Correspondence relating to the Renewalship of the Ani-manthagoody village of the Ramnaad estate.
5/9/45		do	Communicating Bd's opinion that the Selection of Ameens and other officers for the Ram-naad Zemindary should be left to the Collector subject to the revision of the Principal Collector.

List of Retainable papers for 1845-46

Received Letters. *Count of Marks* Madura Collector's Office.

...	Number.	From whom received.	Substance.
11/45	..	Secretary to the Board of Revenue	correspondence relating to the levy of tax on trees in Paumben and Ramesmaram

5

List of Retainable papers for 1842—46

Received Letters Court of Wards Madura Collector's Office.

Date.	Number.	From whom received.	Substance.
12/1/46	..	Secretary to the Board of Rev.	Soliciting information on the nature of the lands claimed by Vitty Tauen as Ambalo Murasi
26/2/46	.. 80		Soliciting information the subject of a claim in a Murasi in the Ramnad Zemindary.
2/4/46	..	Do	Correspondence relating to the administration of the Ramnaad Zemindary.
14/5/46	83	..	Extract from the Proceedings of the Board of Revenue dated 14/5/46, relating to a division of the land to the two Zemindaries of Ettiapooram and Ramnaad.
5/10/46	208	Do	Papers relating to payment to be made to R. Fischer of Salem by the Ranee of Ramnaad.

This Copy of the Original Draft received from Rd with Rev. Procgs. dated 11 Octr/12 to Nos. 6829 & filed was made out in the Ramnad book

The Principal Collector of
Madura

Sir,

I am dd to acknowledge your letter of the 15th Inst. objecting to the Bd's instructions conveyed in my letter of the 8th & begging that in the event of the Board remaining of the same sentiments, the matter may be referred to Govt., & I am instructed to say in reply, that after a careful consideration of your present arguments as well as of your previous Communication, the Board do not see reason to change their former opinion & orders, on any material point.

2. Your first enquiry was whether you are empowered by the Regulations to search the Ramnad Manager's house for his private papers. The charge brought against this man is for Forgery & subornation of forgery, offences cognizable by you only in your capacity as Magistrate. You are not to look to this Board for instruction in that part of your duty, but they remark that even though it should be lawful on sufficient information to make a search for private papers to prove the crimes, yet they are not

aware

aware of any provision of law which would justify such a step with the object which you state, viz to know the amount, & mode of disposal, of the Manager's supposed unauthorized gains. It was for you, as a Magistrate, to estimate the value of the accusation & evidence you had received, and proceed agreeably to the law for the investigation & establishment of the charge. + August 25 para 5

3. With regard to the asserted mismanagements & malversation of the Manager, you seem to have forgotten that he is not in the public service, as subject to the laws for the punishment of dishonesty in the Revenue servants of Govt. If any steps are to be taken against him for such wrongdoing, or any sums embezzled to be recovered, it must be by process in a Court of law; & you are not competent to take a part in such proceedings, except acting on the behalf of the Minor & as an agent of the Court of Wards. To empower you to act at all in the matter, as well as to deprive the Manager of the power of evil, the Board directed that the Estate should be instantly taken under the care of that Court; & they considered your own presence on the spot

necessary

necessary to that measure.
16

4. As to your next enquiry, regarding a search of Peranna Chetty's house for private papers; the Board direct me to inform you that they are not acquainted with any Regulation authorizing such a step in a case of this kind. The Board are surprised that you should express yourself at a loss as to ulterior proceedings after the suspension of your Seristadar; which is specifically ordered to be made "pending further investigation". You yourself expressed both in your earlier communication, & in your remarks on the documents which accompanied it, the very strongest suspicions if it might not be said conviction of his guilt; investigation of his conduct was absolutely necessary, & his previous suspension from office & power, is an indispensible requisite to such enquiry. You object to the severity of such a step; but you urged the adoption of a much harsher measure, the forcible search for the Seristadar's most private papers, in the house of his confidential agent; and this on the very same information, which you so much depreciate on the question of suspension.

5. Lastly, with regard to the Gout.

Vakeel

Vakeel, the Regulations are precise in
specifying the course to be taken where a + Sec. XI Reg: XIV 1816
Court Vakeel is accused of gross acts of
fraud & misconduct. Such charges are
to be investigated by the Judge of the
Court; & no other officer has cognizance;
though for specific injury arising from
such the misconduct of his Vakeel, a Civil
action is open to the client. Your own ⊕ Section XII
positive recommendation seemed to be in ‡ Reg: 27 Para 6 latter part
exact accordance with the law; and
the order given you was based on it.
The Board are therefore quite at a loss
to account for your opposition to that
order.

6. You have now been more
specifically apprised, in the foregoing
paragraphs, of the grounds on which
the Board proceeded in determining on
the orders conveyed to you in my former
letter; & I am directed to require you to
carry them into effect without further
delay; & to report having taken the Estate
under the Court of Wards. The Board
much regret that so much time has
already been permitted to elapse, as they
cannot participate in your confidence
that your proceedings in the matter
hitherto, are a secret to the parties most
deeply interested in them. With reference
to the alternative you suggest, I am

directed

directed to say that the principal papers Connected with this case have already been before the Govt in Council; & the Boards Proceedings in it have been approved, as you will learn from the enclosed order× of Govt.

×Septr 14th 1842 in C 15th "

7 In consideration of the strong reiteration of your former recommendation, the Board so far modify their order, as to permit you to avail yourself of the aid of Mr Fischer in elucidating the two charges brought before you by his means; Viz: the criminal charge against the Manager, & the accusation of bribery & corruption against your Serishtadar. To this, however, his interference must be limited; the Board cannot consent to his taking any part in the administration of the affairs of the Zemindary, & they trust to you to act up to the spirit of this prohibition in its fullest extent.

Reve Bd Office
Fort St George
21st September 1842

Signed/ J. D. Bourdillon
Secretary

(True Copy)

[illegible]
Ag Cr

approving of the proceedings
of the Board in this case.

No. 1701

To
The Prin. Collector of
Madura

Dated 21st }
Desp.d 27th } September 1842

Stating in reply to his
letter of the 15th Instant
objecting to the Board's
instructions on the subject
of certain malversations
in the Ramnad Zamindary
that after a careful con-
sideration of his commun-
ications they see no reason
to change their former opi-
nion & orders on any ma-
terial point & transmitting
copy of an order of Govt. Ε
approving

2

To

The Principal Collector of

Madura

Sir,

Para 1. I am directed by the Bd. of Revenue to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 15th Inst. objecting to the Board's instructions conveyed in my letter of the 8th & begging that in the event of the Board remaining of the same sentiments, the matter may be referred to Government, and I am instructed to say in reply, that after a careful consideration of your present arguments, as well as of your previous communication, the Board do not see reason to change their former opinion & orders, on any material point.

2 Your first enquiry was

whether you are empowered by the Regulation
to search the Ramnad Manager's house
for his private papers. The charge
brought against this man is for Forgery
& Subornation of Forgery. Offences
cognizable by you only in your capacity
as Magistrate. You are not to look to
this Board for instructions in that
part of your duty; but they remark
that even though it should be lawful
on sufficient information to make
a search for private papers to prove
these crimes, yet they are not aware
of any provision of law which would
× P. Collrs. letter justify such a step with the object
27 Augt. Para 5. which you ×state, Vizt. to know the
amount, & mode of disposal, of the
Manager's supposed unauthorized
gains. It was for you, as a Magistrate
to estimate the value of the accusa
& evidence you had received, & pr

23

agreeably to the law for the investigation & establishment of the charge.

3. With regard to the asserted mismanagement & malversation of the Manager, you seem to have overlooked that he is not in the public service, or subject to the laws for the punishment of dishonesty in the Revenue servants of Government. If any steps are to be taken against him for such wrong doing, or any sums embezzled to be recovered, it must be by Process in a Court of Law; & you are not competent to take a part in such proceedings, except acting on the behalf of the Minor as an agent of the Court of Wards. To empower you to act at all in the matter, as well as to deprive the Manager of the power of evil, the Board directed that the Estate should

be

be instantly taken under the care of that Court, & they considered your own presence on the spot necessary to that measure

4. As to your next enquiry regarding a search of Perianna Chetty's house for private papers, the Board direct me to inform you that they are not acquainted with any Regulation authorizing such a step in a case of this kind. The Board are surprised that you should express yourself at a loss as to ulterior proceedings after the suspension of your Sheristadar, which is specifically ordered to be made "pending further investigation" You yourself expressed both in your earlier communication, & in your remarks on the documents which accompanied it, the very strongest suspicions, if it might not be said conviction, of his guilt; investigation of

his

his conduct was absolutely necessary; this previous suspension from Office & power, is an indispensible requisite to such enquiry - You object to the severity of such a step, but you urged the adoption of a much harsher measure, the forcible search for the Serishtadar's most private papers, in the house of his confidential Agent; & this on the very same information which you so much depreciate on the question of suspension -

5. Lastly, with regard to the Government Vakeel; the Regulations are precise in specifying the course to be taken where a Court Vakeel is accused of gross acts of fraud & misconduct - Such charges are to be investigated by the Judge of the Court, & no other Officer has cognizance, though for specific

*See XI Reg XIV of 1816

injury

Sec XII

August 27th
Para 6. latter part

injury arising from such the misconduct of the Vakeel, a civil action is open to the Client. Your own positive recommendation seemed to be in exact accordance with this law, & the order given you was based on it. The Board are therefore quite at a loss to account for your opposition to that order.

6. You have now been more specifically apprised, in the foregoing Paragraphs, of the grounds on which the Board proceeded in determining on the orders conveyed to you in my former letter, & I am directed to require you to carry them into effect without further delay, & to report having taken the Estate under the Court of Wards. The Board much regret that so much time has already been permitted to elapse, as they cannot participate in your confidence that your proceedings

in

in the matter hitherto, are a secret to the parties most deeply interested in them. With reference to the alternative you suggest, I am directed to say that the principal papers connected with this case have already been before the Governor in Council, & the Board's proceedings in it have been approved as you will learn from the enclosed order of Government.+

+No.
14 Sept 1842.

7. In consideration of the strong reiteration of your former recommendation, the Board so far modify their order, as to permit you to avail yourself of the aid of Mr Fischer in elucidating the two charges brought before you by his means, viz the criminal charge against the Manager, & the accusation of bribery & corruption against your

Serishtadar. To this however, his interference must be limited; the Board cannot consent to his taking any part in the administration of the affairs of the Zemindary, & they trust to you to act up to the spirit of this prohibition in its fullest extent.

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your most Obed^t. Servant

J. D. Bourdillon
Secretary.

Rev^e. Board Office
Fort S^t. George
21st. September 1842

Rec^d 26th. [illegible]

To

The Acting Chief Secretary to

Government.

Sir,

Para 1. On the 27th August last the Principal Collector of Madura laid before the Board a body of information regarding extensive corruption Fraud and Forgery, in which the Head Sheristadar of his Office, the Manager of the Ramnad Zemindary, and the Government Vakeel of the Madura Zillah Court were implicated, and which had been brought to his knowledge through the instrumentality of Mr. Fischer, a European Merchant who had had some connection with the affairs of the Zemindary. Mr. Blackburne also shewed the means by

which

which Mr. Fischer became possessed of this information, Vizt that he had received it from the Rance Guardian of Ramnad. and stated the circumstances under which he had come forward with it; Vizt that the Manager had promised him a large sum for his services in a certain negotiation with Government and had broken his en-gagement. Mr. Blackburne solicited in-structions how to proceed on the information, and begged to be permitted to recognise Mr. Fischer as the Rance Guardian's Agent in the investigations that might be ordered –

2. The Board furnished the Principal Collector with instructions, but considering the position in which Mr. Fischer stood in the case with relation to the

31

the Manager, and the motives which in-
duced him to come forward with information,
they refused Mr. Blackburne's request on
that point, and desired that Mr. Fischer's
interference "in any way whatever with the
affairs or management of the Estate"
should "be most strictly prohibited." at
ber 10. this stage the correspondence was laid
er 15. before Government. In a second commu-
nication Mr. Blackburne objected to the
tenor of the Board's orders, and among other
points, strongly reiterated his request that
Mr. Fischer's agency might be made use
of in the enquiry. and the Board then so
Para 7. far modified their former orders as to
permit the Principal Collector "to avail
(himself) of the aid of Mr. Fischer in elu-
cidating the two charges brought before
(him) by his means." These two letters
also

also were communicated to Government - September

3. A petition was subsequently

received from the manager, complaining

that Mr Fischer's servants and Peons were

associated with those of the Principal

Collector's public establishment in the

proceedings against him - and the Board

then again addressed Mr Blackburne

(in a letter which has been laid before October

Government) explaining more clearly the November

orders intended in their previous letter,

and directing that Mr Fischer should be

"restricted as nearly as circumstances may

"allow to the position which would be

"held by an ordinary person acting as

"Complainant or Prosecutor."

4 In reply to this com-

-munication the Board have received a

letter

21. olumber 4

letter from Mr. Blackburne, which under their directions I have now the honor to request that you will lay before Government. In this letter Mr. Blackburne explains the extent to which he is using the aid of Mr. Fischer and his servants, from which it appears that the latter are associated with the public servants in almost every part of the Principal Collector's proceedings, both within and without the Cutcherry. This is a degree of interference which the Board never contemplated that Mr. Fischer should be allowed to exercise, and it is directly opposed to their last most precise instructions, after the receipt of which, and in avowed opposition to them, the Principal Collector continues the same course. and though he professes

to be willing to alter his mode of proceeding on the repetition of those orders, yet from the general tone of his language and from his plain assertion that he is a better judge of what is proper than they, the Board cannot expect any cordial obedience or co-operation.

Para

5. The Board do not doubt that Mr. Fischer's aid would be very useful to Mr. Blackburne in this enquiry, but their objection to his using it in the way he is doing, is based on other and broader considerations. For, in addition to what is said above of Mr. Fischer's personal connection with the parties, which must render it necessary to receive even his own personal evidence with much caution, they cannot recognize, or indeed too strongly deprecate,

a

a practice in this particular case, of em-
-ploying a European not in the service or
responsible to Government, which followed
out generally would place the proprietors
of Estates at the mercy of Mr. Fischer or
any other speculator of the same description.
The employment of Sambeen Mr. Fischer's
Headman is still objectionable, he is, to say
the least a person whose character is
liable to the greatest suspicion, and who
is very unfit to be placed in the confiden-
-tial position in which it appears from
Mr. Blackburne's letter that he has been
employed -

6. It is with much regret
that the Board feel themselves compelled
to bring before Government in this
manner the conduct of a public functionary

of

of long standing and high rank, who has ever, and they are persuaded deservedly, held the very highest character for in-tegrity, zeal, and public spirit; but at the point to which this matter has now come, the Board deem it incumbent on them to place the case before Government with the view that their orders to the Principal Collector may be confirmed and enforced if approved, or otherwise that they themselves may receive instructions for their guidance—

7 Allusion is made in the Petition of Mootachella Taven to pecuniary transactions between Mr. Blackburne and Mr. Fischer; and in explanation Mr. Blackburne has forwarded for the Board's perusal

copy

copy of his Account Current for the last two years with the Firm at Salem of which Mr Fischer is a Member - These transactions appear to be confined to remittances for the purchase of Bills on England, as opportunities offered, the amount, during deposit, bearing interest at 8 per Cent - Messrs Fischer and Co were, at the time, in no way under Mr Blackburne's authority, and the Board consider him to have acted in strict accordance with the spirit and intention of the orders of Government communicated to the Principal Collector of Tanjore under date 1st May 1827, and as far as Mr Blackburne is concerned

the

the Board have been led to make these observations only with a view to prevent any misapprehension - The Government may however perhaps concur in opinion with the Board that the facts here brought to notice form an additional ground for prohibiting the interference of Mr Fischer in the enquiry now pending before Mr Blackburne except as an ordinary person acting as Complainant or Prosecutor -

8 In conclusion I am directed to add that a Copy of this letter will be furnished to the Principal Collector of Madura for his information and in order that Government may have

39

have before them the whole of the proceedings I am instructed to forward two letters that have recently passed in connection with the case.

[Left margin:]
…d. Colr. Octr 30.
…d. Novr. 5.

…enue Board Office
Fort St George,
…th November 1842.
…d. 18th J.B.
18th

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient Servant

(Signed) J. D. Bourdillon
Secy.

(True Copy)

J. D. Bourdillon
Secretary

…d. Lambert

Revenue Board office,
Fort St. George,

No. 15th December 1842

Recd 23d December 1842

From,

J. D. Bourdillon Esqre

Secretary to the Board of Revenue

To.

G. D. Drury Esqre

Commissioner Madura.

Sir,

Revenue Department — Para 1 With reference to the letter from the Principal Collector dated 18th Ultimo, I am directed by the Board of Revenue to point out to you that it is not required by the Regulation that the Manager of a property under the Court of Wards shall be of the same family or even caste as the minor.

2 With regard to the proposal in the 3d para of that letter, the Board

Board observe that the nomination of a manager for an Estate under their custody is not left to the option of the Court of Wards, and they request that you will select a fit person for the office, and make a recommendation in his favor to the Court.

3 You will be pleased at the same time to state your sentiments as to the amount of Salary to be allowed him, and adverting to Para 3 of Mr Blackburne's letter the Board trust that you will give your attention to the settlement of the Moyen Establishment of the Zemindary on an efficient yet economical scale.

Revenue Bd Office
Fort St George
15th December 1842
Dispd 20th Do

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your most Obedient Servant,

J. D. Bourdillon
Secretary

To
G. D. Drury Esqre
Commissioner Madura
Comp. Ashambert.

From the Board
dated 15th Decr
1842
Received 23rd Decemb
184

Revenue Board Office,
Fort St. George.

Rec. 16th January 1843.
25 January 1843

From
J. D. Bourdillon Esqre.
Secretary to the Board of Revenue

To,
G. D. Drury Esqre.
Commissioner in Madura.

Sir,

Revenue Department.

January 9. 1843.

With reference to the Extract from the Proceedings of the Court of Wards noted in the margin, I am directed to communicate to you the remarks of the Court on the proposed Moyeen Jabtah of Servants for the Ramnad Zemindary, submitted with your letter of the 3rd Instant.

The Court observe in the first place that you make no provision whatever for a Hindivy account department. They think it important

important for the sake of accuracy and perspicuity in the accounts of the estate that they should be recorded in Hindvy, and this is of the more consequence as the financial history of each year is to be submitted to the Collector; and as circumstances may occur to render it necessary to bring the whole revenue management under examination. —

Clause third Section XII Regulation V of 1804.

Section XXIV

The Court would wish you therefore to reconsider this part of your proposal. It is also observed that it is not intended to have any establishment at the Collector's office. When the Estate was formerly under the Collector an addition was made to the Hoozoor establishment of that officer to the amount of 462 Rupees monthly. So large a charge as this does not seem necessary when the Estate is

administered

administered by a Manager under the Court of Wards; but the Court would wish you to consider whether a slight increase would not be desirable. On comparing your proposed Moyeen Japtah with that sanctioned when the Estate was under management before, the Court observe that the number of Servants is considerably increased, while the aggregate of their Salaries is diminished.-

Encl. A No 4 in a letter from the Collr 21st Decr 1824.-

3. You propose in accordance with Section XI Regulation V of 1804 to allot 10 per cent of the permanent settlement for the support of the Minor and his relations. This amounts to 33,156 : 8 : 8 a year, but it is observed that the detailed allowances shewn in Statement A amount to 3205 : 14 : 4 a month, which

comes

comes to 38,470 : 12 : - a year. Statement A appears to be a record of Mr. Blackburne's arrangements, and the remark in the conclusion of Para. 6 of your letter may be intended to refer to some of these allowances; but the Court wish to be informed of the particular manner in which you propose to distribute the 2700 Rupees monthly, resulting from a tenth of the annual Paishcush.

4. In conclusion I am desired to point out an important error which appears in Statement A; the total of the Palace expenses is set down at 7,318 : 8 : 10, while the real amount of the items is only 3798 : 10 : 4. The total includes 3,511 : 6 : 6, the proposed cost of the Manager's

Office

Office and Talook Establishments, which are not given among the particulars of the Statement. There are one or two other errors in the accounts, of minor importance but which tend to prevent their corresponding and obscure their meaning. These are ascribable no doubt to the temporary want of an efficient Superintendent at the Head of the Native Department of your office. It is requested that in replying to this communication, you will submit corrected detail statements.

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Your most obed[t] servt.

Revenue Board Office,
Fort St. George,
16th January 1843.
Desp 23 Do.

J. D. Bourdillon

Secretary

To

G. D. Drury Esqre.

Commissioner in Madura.

To

G. D. Drury Esquire

Commissioner in charge of the Zillah of Madura

The Ranee Purvathavurthany Nachear, the Mother and Guardian of Dorarajah Nachiar the Minor heiress of the Ramnad Zemindary presents Salams -

1 - I did myself the honor to address you one Urzee under date the 5th. Inst., setting forth the particulars of my right to the Zemindary, and submitting what I wished to be done, and urging the reasons for my making answer myself to the Suit instituted agt. me by Moottoo Veeroyee Nachear for the Zemindary, and accompanied it with all neces--sary documents; a second under date the 6th. on the subject of the insulting and intimidating Notice stuck up in public in this place; a third & fourth under date the 9th. regarding the key of the Pagoda and the cows; a fifth under date the 10th. bringing to your notice for correction the wanton attack and outrage perpetrated against my Vakeel Kistnarow by the late Manager's Brother in law Poolar Taven and the mob of dan--gerous characters raised and headed by him;

a sixth and seventh under date the 11th explaining the distribution of cloths &c., made by me on the joyful occasion of my child commencing to learn to write and read, & about the Pyttoo Tope Bungalow; an eighth, ninth & tenth, under date the 13th regarding the Cavadies required to be sent to the Palaney Pagoda according to the long established custom of the Samusthanom, and complaining of the Sathe Jassildar having prevented the Bramins of the Balasoobramaneah Sawmy Pagoda from bringing the daily Offering of cocoanuts to be touched by my child, and of having usurped to himself that privelege appertaining to the owner of the Estate alone, and about the produce of the Gardens at Ramnad, making altogether ten urzees not one of which have you vouchsafed to notice; and you have treated them & their writer with the contempt and neglect, which I humbly submit she has done nothing to deserve. If a Gentleman holding the rank and authority that you do, treats me in this way where shall I look for justice and protection.

2 If by your interference, and by treating me with discourtesy and as if I had no interest in the Estate, and by denying me

to address you on the 5th Inst., and of the requests
it contained, I have been unable to take any mea-
-sures in regard to the many frauds & mal-practices
committed by the late Manager, as more particularly
set forth in the 9th para of said Urzee, or for the re-
-covery of the property &c. made away with by him,
or for the defence of the Suit instituted against me
by his half sister; and this studied neglect of
me on your part subjects me besides to many
inconveniences and sufferings, & my property to
very eminent danger.

6 - - - Therefore I implore you to be gra-
-ciously pleased to accord me answers to my
Urzee of the 5th Inst. and the several other
Urzees that I have written you since, and to
protect me & further to grant me copies on
stamp paper of this Urzee and the Urzee of
the 5th Instant without delay for submis-
-sion to the Provincial Court to avert an
ex parte Decision threatened imme-
-diately in the Suit instituted by Moottoo
Viroyee Kachian against me; and to re-
-turn me the documents which accompa-
-nied

ined the said Verzee of the 5th Instant -

Ramnad
25 January
1843

With many Salams

(Signed) Ranee Paroovathavurthany
Nachiar

(True Copy)

Incl No 148 of 1843.

PC 1843 D
in No 188

me my most simple and reasonable requests, you prevent my exercising my just and inherent rights and previleges — rights and previleges acknowledged and ratified by the Sudder Court proceedings of the 10th November 1840 and by Regulation V of 1827 and by Section XXIII Regn. V of 1804, of making answer to the false and iniquitous suit instituted in the Southern Provincial Court by the late Guardian Moottoo Veeroyee Nachiar against me for the zemindary, valuing it at 23 lacs & odd Rs. with the object of defrauding me & my child of our property; and the rights of myself and my child be thereby endangered and sacrificed, whom am I to hold responsible for the calamitous results of such conduct on your part — this is a matter deserving of your most serious attention, and one in which it is of the last importance to me to learn your sentiments & intentions with the least possible delay —

3 If you will attentively peruse and consider the 4th para of the proceedings of the Sudder Adalut of the 10th November 1840 suggesting and pointing out the policy & propriety, "if Moottoo Veeroyee Nachiar sued for the zemindary, of my setting up my own right to it, which

9

I had only waived in favor exclusively of my child;"
the provisions of Regn. V of 1829 and the latter part
of the letter of the 16th April 1841 from the Board
to the Government regarding my right of succession,
You cannot fail to perceive the justice of the
claim I am compelled to assert-

4- In claiming the charge on behalf
of my child of the Zemindary, my hereditary and
legal right to which had been unwittingly given
away by my late husband to that child contrary
to the Hindoo Law and the aforesaid Regn. V,
I respectfully submit I not only but demand
the just & reasonable exercise of that Law of
our caste and [illegible] country and of that Regulation
of the Company's Government and avail myself
of the deliberate suggestion of the High Court
of Suder Udalut, and do no injury or injustice
to my child, who naturally is the heir to all my
property, as she is to my love and affection but
I take the surest method of Guarding myself and
my property, and thereby the interests of my child
from mismanagement & mischief

5 In consequence of your perfect
silence and disregard of the urgee I had the honor
to

[illegible]

ஸ்ரீ அனையபதி

தெணவரிசை

உயகூ - உ

ஸ்ரீராமநாதபுரம்.

ராணிபருவதவர்
த்தனிநாச்சியார்

Revenue 1843 Department
Cons^d 14th February
No 188
No ~~[illegible]~~ of 1843.

From Ranee Parvathavurthany Nachiar the mother & Guardian of Ranee Dorarajah Nachiar the minor Heiress to the Ramnad Zemindary in Madura.

J

JB

Dated 29 Jany 1843

K

Recd 2^d Feby 43.

with 1 Enclosure.

Encloses Copy of an address to the Commissioner. Protests against the want of courtesy on the part of that gentleman in not answering her letters. States that no reply having been received to her letter of the 5th she is unable to afford an answer to the Civil Court, who are in consequence about to try the suit ex parte. Prays that her letter to Mr Drury be taken into consideration & redress granted.

Recd 4 Augt 1843 JB.

[illegible]

உ

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

61

Revenue Board Office,
Fort St. George,

3d August, 1843.

Recd 8th [illegible]

From
C. C. Lovell Esqre
Acting Secretary to the
Board of Revenue

To
J. Blackburne Esqre
Principal Collector of
Madura.

Sir,

Rev. Department 1

I am directed by the Court of Wards to acknowledge the receipt of Mr. Morehead's letter of the 24 June last, submitting a Petition from Moottoo Chella Taven the late Manager of the Ramnad Estate complaining of your having dispossessed him of the little palace at

Ramnad

Ramnad which he claims as his private property -

2 If the Petitioner was only allowed to occupy the palace as Manager of the Estate, when he ceased to hold that situation it would seem a matter of course that he should quit the Building, but if he resided therein as a member of the family the Court are of opinion that he should be reinstated in possession of it -

Revenue Board Office,
Fort St George,
5th August, 1843.
Despd 4 do -
Recd 8th [illegible]

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient Servant

[illegible]
Acting Secretary

To
J. Blackburne Esqre
Principal Collector of
Madura

Compd [illegible]

Revᵉ Bᵈ office,
Fort Sᵗ George,
28ᵗʰ Septʳ 1843.
Recᵈ 9ᵗʰ Octʳ [illegible]

63

From
E. C. Lovell Esqʳᵉ
Acting Secretary to the
Board of Revenue

To
J. Blackburne Esqʳᵉ
Principal Collector of
Madura.

Sir,

Para 1. I am directed by the Court of Wards to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 16ᵗʰ Instant.

2. If you consider the two Curnums alluded to disqualified for their office and can establish this fact before the Court, the Court of Wards are of opinion that you should proceed against them

as

as directed by Regulation XXIX of 1802 i.e to file a Civil action to procure their removal..

3. The Sudr Court have ruled that in Zemindaries under temporary management, the Collector can only exercise those powers in reference to Curnums which are by Law vested in the Zemindars, and as they have no authority to dismiss a Curnum without the sanction of the Courts so the Collector standing in their place can have none.-

Rev. Bd. Office,
Fort St. George,
28th Septr. 1843.
Desp. 4 Octr. do.
Recd. 9th JB

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant
[signature]
Secretary

To
J. Blackburne Esqr.
Princl. Collr. of
Madura..

Compd. Cr. Srotambert

Revenue Board Office,
Fort St George,
25th January 1844
Recd 2d February

From E. C. Lovell Esqre
Acting Secretary to the
Board of Revenue

To J. Blackburne Esqre
Principal Collector of
Madura.

Sir,

Revenue Dept. Para 1. I am directed to acknowledge the receipt of your letter dated 20th November last. The Board do not see any objection to your inflicting the fine mentioned in Para 1 on the Umbalagar and Shroff of Pallianuttam in the Ramnad Zemindary who has been convicted of

of illegal exaction.—

2 With respect to the question whether a Collector has power under Regulation IX of 1822 to dismiss Curnums in a Zemindary under Wardship, I am directed to transmit for your inform=ation the enclosed correspondence in which you will find it distinctly stated as the opinion of the Sudr Udalut that "a Curnum of a Village of which the land revenue has been settled permanently, cannot be removed, except by a decree of a Civil Court on a regular suit to be instituted for the purpose" and by section VIII Regulation VI of 1831 "Curnums in Districts in which the

From Chief Se[cretary]
13th September 18[..]
and Enclosures

67

the land revenue has been permanently fixed" are declared not included among the persons holding Hereditary Village or other Offices in the revenue and police departments. who "shall be under the immediate authority and control of the Collector".-

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient Servant

G. E. Lamb

Acting Secretary.

Revenue Bd. Office,
Fort St. George,
25th January 1844.
Desp 29th Do.
Recd 2nd Feby J.B.

To J. Blackburne Esqre
Principal Collector of
Madura.

Comp. Cholambert

Fort St. George 13th September, 1831.
Recd 2 Feby 1844 - JD

No. 838

69

Gentlemen,

Revenue Department.

I am directed by the Right Honorable the Governor in Council to transmit for your information and guidance, the accompanying copy of an Extract from the Proceedings of the Sudr Udalut under date the 2d. September 1830, with the copy of a letter thereupon addressed to them and a copy of the reply.—

st September 1830.
th September, 1831.

I have the honor to be &ca.

(Signed) H. Chamier

Chief Secretary.

To

The President and Members
of the
Board of Revenue.

Extract

Extract from the Proceedings of the Sudr Udalut, under date the 2d September 1830.

Read the following letters from the Provincial Court for the Southern Division. —

1 In the last of these communications the Provincial Court in the Southern Division at the request of the Judge in the Zillah of Salem, has submitted to this Court the question, whether the Curnum of a village, the land revenue of which has been permanently fixed under Regulation XXV 1802, can be removed from office, except by order of a Civil Court of judicature, on a regular suit instituted for the purpose. In the previous letter they forwarded

-ed a communication from the Judge of Salem, detailing his reasons for a modification of such part of the Regulation abovementioned, as regards Curnums in settled districts.

2. With reference to the provisions contained in Section XI Re-gulation XXV, and in Sections V and VII Regulation XXIX, 1802, the Court of Sudr Udalut concur in opinion with the Provincial Court in the Southern Division, that a Curnum of a Village of which the revenue has been settled perma-nently, cannot be removed, except by a decree of a Civil Court, on a regular suit to be instituted for the purpose. It is true ~~that the~~ first of the sections above referred to allude to

the

the "trial and punishment" of the Curnum, and to the "Sentence" of the Court of Judicature; terms which, if they stood alone, might lead to the inference that a criminal, and not a Civil, tribunal is intended; but the enactment goes on to declare expressly that the proceeding shall be by a "Suit in the adawlut of the Zillah;" and Section VII Regulation XXIX, in cases of incapacity also, declares, that the proof must be "before the Judge of the Zillah."—

3 The Court of Sudr Udalut see no reason to modify the existing law in this respect; and in submitting to the Government, under date the 28th January last, draft of a Regulation, by which hereditary village

or

73

or other offices in the revenue and Police departments were placed under Collectors, and the incumbents were declared liable to removal by them, subject to the orders of the Board of Revenue or of Government, the office of Curnums in permanently settled districts was expressly exempted from this rule.—

Ordered that under the orders of Government of the 19th October 1824, extract of these proceedings be forwarded to the Secretary to Government in the Judicial Department for the information of the Right Honorable the Governor in Council.—

(A true Extract)

(Signed) A. D. Campbell

Register

To

To

The Judges of the

Sudr Udalut.

Gentlemen,

Para. 1 I am directed to acknowledge the receipt of your Register's letter of the 2d. Instant, No. 110.

2. The Right Honorable the Governor in Council requests that the several communications from the lower Courts on the subject of the Regulations regarding the office of Curnum, referred to in your Proceedings under date the 2d., an Extract from which accompanied the letter under reply, may be laid before Government.

3 The Right Honorable

the

the Governor in Council at the same time desires that you will state whether the construction of the Regulations given in Parah 2 of your Proceedings is applicable to the removal of Curnums in Zemindaries which have either reverted to Government or have come temporarily, from whatever cause, under the management of a Collector.—

I have the honor to be &c

(Signed) H. Chamier
Secretary to Government

Fort St. George,
1st September, 1830.

To
The Chief Secretary to Government.

Sir,

I am directed by the Judges

Judges of the Court of Sudr Udalut to acknowledge the receipt of your letter, No. 566, dated the 21st September last, to which from some oversight in this office, an answer has not hitherto been furnished.—

2 Regulation VI of 1831 having in the interim been promulgated, the Judges conclude, that the communications, specified in the second paragraph of your letter, are not now required.—

3 In the 3rd paragraph is expressed the desire of the Right Honorable the Governor in Council, that the Judges will state "whether "the construction of the Regulations "given in parah 2 of the proceedings "of the Court under date the 2d September "1830," is applicable "to the removal of

Curnums

"Curneems in Zemindaries, which have
"either reverted to Government, or have
"come temporarily, from whatever
"cause, under the management of
"a Collector."—

77.

4 The construction of the Regulations, given in the proceedings of Sudr Udalut above quoted, holds good in the opinion of the Judges in cases, where a Collector may manage a district for the proprietor, in as much as the former can of course exercise those powers only, which are vested by law in the latter.—

5 But when Zemindaries have reverted to the Government, the proprietary right, contemplated in Section III Regulation XXIX of 1802, being no longer in existence, the construction

above

above referred to does not apply.—

Sudr Udalut, Register's Office, 5th September, 1831.

I have the honor to be,

&c.

(Signed) W. Hudleston

Register

(True Copies)

(Signed) H. Chamier

Chief Secretary

(True Copies)

[illegible]

Acting Secretary

Compd. [illegible]

Recd 14 July 1844 JB

Revenue Department

Extract from the Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 4th July 1844

Read the following Extract from the Minutes of Consultation under date the 10th June 1844.

(Here enter No. 554)

Resolved that copy of Paras 1 to 3 of the foregoing Extract from the Minutes of Consultation, together with copy of the Honble Courts letter therein referred to, be transmitted for the information of the Principal Collector of Madura. Mr Blackburne will be pleased to furnish the information called for by Government in Para 3.

(A true Extract)

Despd 10 July 1844
compd [illegible]

Recd 14th JB

[illegible]
A. Secretary

Revenue Department

No. 554.

Extract from the Minutes of Consultation
Under date the 10th June 1844.

Para 1 The Most Noble the Governor in Council proceeds to take into consideration the letter in this Department from the Honorable the Court of Directors dated 2d April 1844 No. 8.

2 A Copy of this Despatch will be furnished for the information and guidance of the Board of Revenue and for communication to the Principal Collector of Madura.

3 The Board will be pleased to furnish the information required

by

by the Honorable Court in pursuit relative to the result of the suit instituted by Mr Fischer against the late Manager of the Ramnad Zemindary.

61

Revenue Department.

No 8 of 1844.

Our Governor in Council at Fort St George.

Letter dated 13 Dec. (No 61) 1842
Do. dated 7th Augt. (No. 32) 1843.

1. In the first of these letters you inform us that "in consequence "of its having been brought to "your notice in a correspondence "submitted by the Board of Revenue, "respecting the affairs of the Ramnad

"Ramnad Zemindary in the district of
"Madura, that extensive fraud and
"corruption pervaded the Collector's
"Establishment and that Mr. Blackburne
"had pertinaciously refused to
"obey the orders issued by his imme-
-diate official Superiors against
"availing himself of the services of
"Mr. Fischer and his Servants in
"the investigations connected with
"the Estate, you had resolved to
"suspend that Gentleman and to
"appoint under the provisions
"of Regulation 8 of 1822 a Commissioner
"to investigate generally into the
"administration of the Madura district

and

"and of the Officers by whom it
"was conducted and particularly
"so in connection with the Ramna
"Estate"

6th Decr 1842

3rd Feby 1843

2 For this duty Mr Drury
the Second Member of the Board
of Revenue was selected, and
subsequently with the view of
enabling the enquiry to be brought
to a speedier termination Mr
Morehead, Judge and Criminal
Judge of Chingleput, was added
to the Commission -

3 With your letter dated
the 7th August (No 32) 1843 you
have transmitted the Report of
the Commissioners together with
the

the Minutes of the several members of your Government and your final Resolutions thereupon.

4 A considerable portion of paras 1 to 53 the Commissioners' report is taken up with the result of their enquiries into the general revenue administration of the district. In this Investigation Mr. Morehead took no part as it had been completed by Mr. Drury previously to his arrival in the district. Letter dated 10th May 1843.

5 The main points in which Mr. Drury considered the practice prevailing in Madura to be

inconsistent

85

inconsistent with the true principles of a ryotwar settlement or otherwise objectionable appear to be the system under which accounts of produce were made up by the agency of the Village Officers. The rules for adjusting claims to remission on account of withered crops – the demand of revenue before the removal of crops from the ground – defective control over expenditure in the Maramut department, and the mode of conducting investigations into cases cognizable under Regulation 9 of 1822 and 7 of 1828.

[De]partment
[of] Public Works
[&] Irrigation.

The

The Commissioners' Report so far as it relates to these subjects has been referred for the consideration of the Board of Revenue with instructions to report their sentiments thereon for the information of your Government. The practices discussed by Mr Drury if ultimately considered to be objectionable may be readily rectified by the Board of Revenue in the ordinary exercise of their controlling authority. The general merits of Mr Blackburne's revenue administration have been repeatedly noticed

by

by the Board of Revenue,
the Government and ourselves,
and considering the admitted
improvement which has taken
place in the resources of the
Madura district since it has
been under his charge a few
occasional instances of want
of judgment or departure from
recognized principles can
scarcely be converted into
matters of accusation against
his management, especially
if it be correct as stated

by

by Mr Morehead that "the Letter 10th Jany

"revenue administration of the

"district although professedly

"a ryotwar one has always been

"conducted under different Collectors

"rather in accordance with their

"own peculiar views as to what

"seemed best suited to the imme-

-diate state of the district and

"habits of the people than with

"any fixed ryotwar principles

"or rules of management."

7 It is obvious that this

state of things ought not to

be permitted to continue and

that

that the revenue administration of a district must not be allowed to be dependent on the individual opinions of the Officer in Charge, but that it should be conducted in accordance with fixed rules and principles laid down by the Board of Revenue with the sanction of your Government which it is the especial duty of the Board to maintain in practice.

8 The general charges of corruption and dishonesty brought

brought by the Collector
against his Native Establish-
-ment have proved on investi-
-gation to be untenable. Of
the specific charges alleged
against the Head Sherishtadar
Sashagherry Row, two were
enquired into by Mr Blackburne,
and considered by him to be
proved. In both these cases
the decision of the Principal
Collector has been reversed
by the Board of Revenue on
appeal, and for reasons which
are perfectly satisfactory
to us. The third charge
on

on which no decision had been passed by Mr Blackburne was investigated by the Commissioners and considered by them to be equally untenable.—

9 It is much to be regretted that Mr Blackburne should have given such ready credence to the accusations which were brought against his servants on the representations of Mr Fischer and which on a close investigation could not be substantiated.—

10. The point in which the conduct of Mr Blackburne has been the most blameable is in his having permitted Mr Fischer and his servants to interfere in the public affairs of the district.—

11. In reply to a letter dated the 27th August 1842 in which Mr Blackburne brought to the notice of the Board the alleged malversations in the Ramnad Zemindary

Zemindary to which his attention has been turned through the instrumentality of Mr Fischer, he was informed that while the Board "desire to express their "acknowledgments to Mr Fischer for "the readiness with which he has come "forward to give information on this "occasion they consider it most inexpedient "that he should be permitted to interfere "in any way whatever with the affairs "or management of the Estate, and desire "that this be most strictly prohibited."

12. On a further application 15th Sept 184[illegible] from Mr Blackburne urging the necessity of his being permitted to avail himself of the assistance of Mr Fischer, the Board state that "in consequence of the strong 21st Sept 18[illegible] "reiteration of his former recommendation "they so far modify their order as to "permit him to avail himself of the aid of

"of Mr Fischer in elucidating the two
"charges brought before him by his
(Mr Fischer's) means, Vizt the Criminal
"charge against the manager and the
"accusation of bribery and corruption
"against his Sheristadar. To this however
"his interference must be limited, the
"Board cannot consent to his taking any
"part in the administration of the
"affairs of the Zemindary, and they trust
"to him (Mr Blackburne) to act up to
"the spirit of the prohibition to its
"fullest extent".

13 Notwithstanding the very limited extent to which the Board reluctantly permitted Mr Blackburne to avail himself of the assistance of Mr Fischer, they were compelled, after the receipt of a further communication from Mr Blackburne, to represent to Government that "Mr Fischer and

his

"his servants were associated with the
"public servants in almost every part
"of the Principal Collector's proceedings
"both within and without the Cutchery".
"This" they remark "is a degree of
"interference which the Board never
"contemplated, that Mr Fischer should
"be allowed to exercise, and it is directly
"opposed to their last most precise
"instructions after the receipt of which
"and in avowed opposition to them the
"Principal Collector continues the same course,
"and though he professes to be willing
"to alter his mode of proceeding on the
"repetition of those orders, yet from the
"general tone of his language and from
"his plain assertion that he is a better
"judge of what is proper than they, the
"Board cannot expect any cordial
"obedience or co-operation".

On

14 On this representation Mr Blackburne was suspended from Office pending an enquiry into the general state of the revenue administration of Madura by Mr Drury as Commissioner

15 The description given by the Board of Revenue of the extent and nature of Mr Fischer's interference is fully confirmed by the Commissioners report paras 86 to 122.

16 Of Mr Fischer's conduct in prosecuting a claim to remuneration for the pretended exertion of his influence in obtaining a settlement of the claim to Moturpha remission on the part of the Ramnad Zemindar we are not called on to express an opinion, but we desire to be informed

informed of the result of the Suit which Mr. Fischer instituted against the late manager of the Ramnad Zemindary. The proceeding of Mr. Blackburne in permitting an individual not in our service nor in any way responsible to your Government to interfere in a matter in which he had a large personal interest was in the first instance most indiscreet, and his pertinaciously continuing in that line of conduct after the express prohibition of the Board of Revenue was in the highest degree reprehensible and justly called down upon him the displeasure of your Government. –

The

17 The Commissioners observe that they "feel enabled to declare "their perfect conviction that "whatever in this matter may have "been Mr. Blackburne's errors in "judgment, his Official acts are "to be attributed entirely to his "anxiety to discharge fully and "conscientiously his duty towards "the Government and the parties "implicated. Other motives he could "have none. His long established "character for uprightness would "of itself protect him from all "imputation of improper feelings, "but when in addition to this "it is found that the head or "native servant of his Office in whose

whose praise he lost no opportunity of writing to Superior authority has been denounced and condemned by himself it is rendered un-
"deniable that nought save the
"most positive belief in his own
"mind as to the guilt of the
"parties charged would have
"induced him to follow the
"course he has pursued."–

18. Under all the circum-stances of the case we are of opinion that the preferable course would have been to have adopted the plan indicated by your President in his Lordship's minute of the 20th June 1843 and to have availed yourselves of

of the services of Mr. Blackburne
in another district. We shall no
however disturb your decision by
which he has been permitted to
resume the appointment of
Principal Collector of Madura
and to draw the allowances of the
Office from the date of his
suspension, and we entirely approv
your having coupled his restoration
to Office with a warning that
"on any repetition of disobedience
"to Superior authority on any occasion
"whatever or in any instance of
"permitting Mr. Fischer or his
"Servants to exercise any influence
"or interference in the affairs of
"the district" he will be suspended
from

from the public service pending
a reference to us. -

London, — } We are
The 2d April, 1844 } Your loving friends
Recd 14th July JB
(Signed) John Cotton
" John Shepherd
&ca &ca

(A true Extract and Copy)

(Signed) G. D. Drury
Chief Secretary

(True Copies)

[illegible]

Acting Secretary

Compd. [illegible]

Revenue Board Office
Fort St George,
10th October, 1844
Recd 20th JB

(6)

From

E. C. Lovell Esqr.
Acting Secretary to the
Board of Revenue,

To J. Blackburne Esqr.
Principal Collector
of
Madura -

Sir,

Revd. Departt.

I am directed by the Board of Revenue to call your attention to the Extract from the Boards Proceedings under date the 29th April last and to my letter dated 16th May, and to request that you will be good enough to furnish the further

further information required by Government regarding the claim of 4th April 1844 Ragoonada Moottoo Chella Taver to the little palace at Ramnad.

Rev B. Office,
Fort St George,
10th October, 1844.
Desp 16 d.
Rec 20th

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient Servant

G. L. Lane (?)
Act. Secretary

To
J. Blackburne Esqre
Principal Collector
of
Madura.

Compd. [illegible]

Revenue Bd. Office,
Fort St. George,
31st March, 1845.
Recd 7 April 45

From
T. Pycroft Esqre.
Secretary to the
Board of Rev.

To
J. Blackburne Esqre.
Principal Collector of
Madura.

Sir,

Revd. Depart. Para. 1 I am directed by the Board of Revenue to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 4th Instant, on the subject of the alienation which is stated to have taken place of the two ain Villages of Siroovayel and Keelapanagoor yielding Rupees 1981-3-10 per annum appertaining to the Ramnad

Ramnad Zemindary by the late
manager as an Endowment for the
support and maintenance of a
Chuttrum which was founded in
the year 1838 by the late Manager
of Ramnad and his Sister their Guardian
for the purpose of affording assistance
and relief to the numerous pilgrims
resorting thither en route to Rameswarum.

2 The Board observe that
under the provisions of Regulation
XXV of 1802 Section XII it would not
be competent for the proprietor herself
in the first instance to appropriate
the Villages in question for the
charitable purpose alluded to, much
less had the manager authority
to exempt such lands from bearing

their

their full proportion of assessment without the consent of Government having been previously solicited and obtained for that purpose.— 105

3\. Without questioning the benefits accruing from the Charitable nature of the Endowment, to the numerous persons for whose relief the Chuttrum was originally founded, the Board concur with you in considering that the appropriation of the two Villages above mentioned and which form part of the Estate of Ramnad was not justifiable, and they accordingly direct that they be resumed, and the full amount of the assessment carried to the account of the Zemindary.—

Revenue Bd. Office, Fort St. George, 31st March 1845.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
your most obedient Servant.

Recd. 3 April '45. Recd. 7th J.B.

[signature]

J. Blackburne Esqr.
Principal Collector of Madura

Received 26th June 1845 TB

(D) 10

Extract from the Minutes of Consultation dated 14th June 1845.

Resolved that Vizia Ragoonada Mootoo Chella Taver be informed with reference to the Petitions addressed to Government under date the 22d March 1844 and 11th May 1845, that his claim to the "Little Palace" at Ramnad should be established in Court.

(Signed) E. P. Thompson
Secy to Government

Extract from the Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 19th June 1845.

Ordered to be communicated to

to the Principal Collector of Madura with reference to his letter dated 25th April last –

(A true Extract)

[illegible]
Secretary –

Despd 21 June 1845

Compd. Tho Lambert

Recd 26th JB

Rev. Bd. office,
Fort St. George,
30th June, 1845.
Recd 5th July 45

109

From

T. Pycroft Esqre
Secretary to the
Board of Revenue,

To

J. Blackburne Esqre
Principal Collector of
Madura.

Sir,

Rev. Deptt. Para 1. I am directed by the Board of Revenue to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 9th Instant requesting instructions in regard to the levy of the Tax on trees in the Island of Ramisseram and in Paumbum.

2nd In reply I am directed to state that before passing orders upon

upon the subject the Board wish to be informed whether this tax appears to have formed part of the assets on which the Peishcush of the Ramnad Zemindary was calculated. whether it would seem from the accounts of the estate to have been collected at any time prior to Fusly 1240, and if so at what date, by whose orders and under what authority it was discontinued - you will also be so good as to state what are the descriptions of trees referred to, and the rates payable upon them severally; whether situated in the backyards gardens and

cultivated

cultivated lands of the Ryots only or in other parts of the Town and Island - and whether the Survamauneam alluded to in Mr. Sub Collector Nelson's Takeed refers only to the Trees or to the lands in which they are situated -

Revenue Office,
Fort St. George,
30th June, 1845.

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient Servant

[illegible]
Secretary

Despd. 2d July 1845
Red. 5th [illegible]

To
J. Blackburne Esqre.
Principal Collector of
Madura.

Comp. [illegible]

113

Revenue Board Office,
Fort St. George,
14th July, 1845.
Recd 11 August 45

No. 446.

From
T. Pycroft Esqre
Secretary to the Board of
Revenue,

To,
J. F. Thomas Esqre
Chief Secretary to
Government.

Revenue Depart.

Sir,

Para 1. I am directed by the Board of Revenue to request that you will submit for the orders of the Most Noble the Governor in Council the accompanying correspondence with the Principal Collector of Madura on the subject of a Suit (No. 3 of 1843) on the file of

From Prinl. Collector	13th September 1843	Para 11.
From Prinl. Collector	4th March 1845.	—
Extract Proceedings Board of Revd.	31st March	" —
From Principal Collector	18th April	" —
To Principal Collector	22d May	" —
From Do. — Do. —	24th May	" —
From Do. — Do. —	27th June	" —

of the Civil Court of that Zillah, in which that Officer has been in=cluded as a Supplemental Defendant.-

2. From these papers it will be seen that the suit in question has been brought by Moottoo Veroyee Nachyar Aunt of the Minor Heiress of Ramnad, against Parrvatha Vurtany Nachyar Mother of the Heiress and against Moottoo Chella Taver the late Manager of the Zemindary, and that in consequence of the estate being at present under the Court of Wards, the Principal Collector has been included as Supplemental Defendant by order of the Court of Sudr Adawlut. The object of the Plaintiff in instituting this action is to prove that the adoption of the

Father

Father of the present Ranee, in virtue of which the Estate has devolved successively upon that in-dividual - on his death in 1830 upon his eldest daughter - and on her death in 1840 upon his younger daughter the present Minor Heiress - was altogether null and void as being contrary to Hindoo Law - that it should consequently be cancelled, and that the Plaintiff should be placed in possession of the Zemindary. It will be remembered that on the death of the Zemindar Ragoonada Ramasawmy in 1830 the Plaintiff was appointed Guardian to his successor the elder sister of the present Ranee - but that on her death in 1840 and on the succession of

From Prinl. Collector 24th April 1830
Board to Government 3d May — —
Extract Minutes of Consultation 28th May — —

From Prinl. Collector 22d February 1840
To Chief Secretary 16th April —
Extract Minutes Consultation 1st June —

of the present Minor, Plaintiff was removed from the Guardianship which was conferred upon the Minor's mother Parvoovatha Nurtany Natchyar. That removal, with other family disputes with which the Government are not unacquainted have in all probability led to the institution of the present Suit.

3. In his proposed answer the Principal Collector has confined himself to a simple denial of liability on the ground that the Suit is exclusively for right of inheritance to the Ramnad Zemindary turning upon the validity of a long passed adoption,

in

in which the Principal Collector
of the District was in no way
concerned - and that his having
been included as a Defendant
can only have been to satisfy
some matter of Form. -

4. It appears to the Board
that the view taken by Mr.
Blackburne is correct. The interests
of Government do not appear to
them to be in any manner affected
by the Suit - and Section XXIII
Regulation V 1804 prescribes that
"disqualified persons being in
"the custody of Guardians, shall
"not be liable to be sued in
"any Action in Courts of Judicature,
otherwise

"otherwise than as under the protection
"and in the joint name of their
"Guardians." In the present instance
the husband of the Minor Heiress
is her Guardian. The Board there=
=fore beg to recommend that the Princl.
Collector may receive authority for
putting in his proposed answer,
which the Board have slightly
modified - and of conducting the
defence on his part as far as may
be necessary at the public expense -

Modification sub=
=sequently cancelled.

5. In his letter of 4th. March last
Mr. Blackburne requests sanction for
disbursing from the funds of the
Estate to the Husband and Guardian
of the Minor Heiress the sum
of

119

Statt. No. 1 March 4, 1845. of Rupees 1436 : 12 : being the amount already advanced by him and by the Mother of the Minor for the defence of the Suit, as also for the payment of such further sum as may be required for the pur-

Statt. No. 2 - do - -chase of certain Law Books likely to be of service in the conduct of the defence. As it is obviously but reasonable that those acting in behalf of the Ranee should be reimbursed any sums which they may have expended for the purpose of maintaining her title to the Zemindary, and as, in a matter which turns entirely upon questions of Hindoo Law, and in which

interests

interests of such magnitude are involved, it is desirable that every facility should be given for consulting such authorities as may be expected to throw light upon the subjects at issue, the Board beg to recommend that both requests of the Principal Collector may be complied with — They would also suggest that he may be empowered to advance from time to time from the funds of the Zemindary such further sums as may be required for payment of legal expenses and to afford to the Minor such advice and assistance as may properly be expected from him in his capacity of Agent to the Court of Wards. —

I have &c.a

(Signed) J. Bycroft
Secretary

Revenue Board Office,
Fort St. George,
14th July, 1845.

Recd 11 Aug

To J. F. Thomas Esqre
Chief Secretary to Government.

Received 24th Sept. 1845 JH

Revenue Department.

Extract from the Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 18th September 1845.

Read the following letter from the Principal Collector of Madura dated 27th August 1845.

(Here enter No. 175.)

The Board do not clearly gather from the letter above recorded who are the parties at present in actual occupation of the Curnumship of the Anoomunthagoody village of the Ramnad estate whether as they are rather led to suppose Somasoondrum Pillay, and Moottoo Curpa Pillay removed by the Manager and restored by the Principal Collector or Soobramanya Pillay and Moottoo Veera Pillay appointed

appointed by the Manager in place of those already mentioned. They however direct that if Sunnasoondrom Pillay and Moottoo Curpa Pillay are now in possession of the office, they may be maintained in it, and all other parties referred to the Civil Courts. In such case also the Board sanction the refund to Soobramunnya Pillay and Moottoo Veera Pillay of as much of the sum which they originally paid as may be now in deposit. If the actual state of circumstances be not as above supposed the Board will be glad to receive a further communication from the Principal Collector on the subject.

(A true Extract)

Desp^d 19 Sept 1845
Recd 25th JB

(signed)
Secretary

Comp^d [illegible]

Received 4th October 1845 JB

ans. from Bd. 6 Nov 1845.

Rev. Departt.

123

Extract from the Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 25th September 1845.

Read the following letter from the Principal Collector of Madura dated 9th September 1845.

(Here enter No. 186.)

The Board are of opinion, with reference to Clause 5 Section XI Regulation V of 1804, that the selection of Ameen and other officers for the Ramnad Zemindary should be left to the manager of the estate, subject however to the revision of the Principal Collector and the final confirmation of the Court of Wards.

(A true Extract)

[signature]
Secretary

Desp. 30 Septr. 1845

Compd. [illegible]

Revenue Bd. Office,
Fort St. George,
17th November 1845.
Recd 24th ??

From
T. Pycroft Esqre
Secretary to the Board of Revenue,

125

To
J. Blackburne Esqre
Principal Collector of Madura.

Sir,

Revl. Departt. Para 1 — I am directed by the Board of Revenue to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 24th Ultimo, containing further information in regard to the tax on Trees in Paumbum and Ramisseram.

2 — From this the Board learn that this tax did not constitute part of the assets on which the Peishcush of the Ramnad Estate was calculated and that it does not seem to have been collected at any time prior to Fasly 1240.

The

It would however appear that the greater part of the Trees are at a distance from the towns of Paumbum and Ramisseram, and that a small number only are in the back yards of the Ryots.

3. Under these circumstances, I am directed to state that such Trees as may be in the back yards or in similar inclosures attached to the Ryots' houses, should not be subjected to any Tax and that the same rule should (unless opposed to the custom of the Zemindary) apply to Trees situated in land actually under cultivation but with these exceptions there appears to the Board to be no reason why the inhabitants of Paumbum and Ramisseram should be allowed the use or enjoyment of the Trees in

those

127

those islands free of any payment to the Zemindar - and they are therefore of opinion that the demand for these Trees should be made from the current Fusly - Such Trees as may henceforth be planted should also be liable to Tax -

4 It does not appear to the Board that the Tax can properly be collected in arrear for past Fuslies -

Revenue Board Office
Fort St. George,
7th November, 1845.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient Servant
[signature]
Secretary -

Despd 20th — Recd 24th

To
J. Blackburne Esqr.
Principal Collector of Madura.

Compd. [signature]

Revenue B^d Office,
Fort St George,
12th January 1846.
Rec^d 20th

From

T. Pycroft Esqre
Secretary to the Board of Revenue,

To

J. Blackburne Esqre
Principal Collector of
Madura.

Sir,

Rev. Department

With reference to your Endorsement of the 23^d August last on Government Petition N° 938 of 1845 from Villy Taven residing in Ramnad in Madura, I am directed by the Board of Revenue to request that you will afford more detailed information in regard to the Petitioner's case, explaining what is the nature of the lands to

to which he lays claim, a part of which it is observed is stated to be Ambala Mewrassy, and what are your reasons for considering his claim to be cognizable only by the Civil Court.—

Revenue Bd. Office, Fort St. George, 12th January, 1846.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
your Most obedient Servant,

Despd 15th Do.
Recd 20th JB

[signature]
Secretary

To
J. Blackburne Esqre.
Principal Collector of Madura.

Compd. [signature]

Recd 13 June

2

[3]

Revenue Bd Office,
Fort St George,
26th February 1846.
Recd 4 March JB

From

J. Pycroft Esqre
Secretary to the Board of Revenue,

To

J. Blackburne Esqre
Principal Collector of Madura. —

Sir,

Revenue Departt

I am directed by the Board of Revenue to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 29th Ultimo, on the subject of the Petition (No 27 of 1846) presented by certain parties claiming a share in a Curnum Meerasee in the Ramnad Zemindary, and in reply to state that, as the information which you have given is not sufficient to enable the Board to dispose of the case, they beg to request that

you

you will enter upon a further expla-
nation of its merits, stating the
nature of the claims of the several
parties, the time and circumstances
when and under which the Petitioners
were placed by the late Manager
in possession of a portion of the
Meerassi - the time that they remained
in enjoyment of it the circumstances
under which you revised the proceedings
of the Manager, with any other par-
ticulars necessary for the complete
understanding of the question -

Revenue Bd. Office,
Fort St. George,
26 February 1846.
Desp. 27 Do
Rec'd 4 March 1846

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient Servant,

[signature]
Secretary

To
J. Blackburne Esqr.
Principal Collector of
Madura -

Comp. Ashamboot

Ans^d 22^d Apr 6/46

Rev. Board Office
Fort St. George,
2^d April, 1846.
Rec^d 10th D.

133

From

J. Pycroft Esqre
Secretary to the Board of Revenue

To

J. Blackburne Esqre
Principal Collector of
Madura.

Sir,

Rev. Dept. Para 1. I am directed by the Board of Revenue to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of 2^d March, submitting pay rolls of the establish-ment proposed to be entertained for the administration of the Zemindary of Ramnad whilst under sequestration.

2. It would appear to be your impression that the Ramnad estate during the time that it

continues

continues under management by order of Court should be administered as on a former occasion by a Sub Collector, for whose Cutcherry you have proposed the List of Servants contained in Enclosure I in your letter at a Monthly cost of Rupees 781. The Talook Establishment is to be of the same strength as under the Manager, Vizt 2900-14-, Rupees per Mensem. In the Police Establishment you propose an increase above that maintained when the Estate was under wardship of Rups 172-8-, in the Marramut also an increase of Rupees 182-.-.

3. The Board regret that they cannot concur with you in thinking that the administration of the Ramnad Zemindary can require the Sole

Superintendence

135

superintendence of a Sub Collector. They observe that on the previous occasion when Ramnad was placed under a Sub Collector, the Dindigul Sub Division was transferred to the management of the Principal Collector. Dindigul now forming a separate charge, the Board would hope that you would find no difficulty in superintending the administration of Ramnad in addition to your other duties. Some accession to your present Huzoor establishment will probably be required, and for this you will be pleased to submit a separate list.

4 The Board sanction the Talook and Marramut Establishments, and authorize the disbursements

to

to the Servants of their pay from the date of entertainment.

The Police establishment it is remarked, exceeds that employed under the late manager by Rup^s 172-8-, perhaps because it was framed with a view to the Police being placed under the special charge of a Joint Magistrate. The Superintendence of the Ramnad Police remaining as before with the Magistrate it is requested that this establishment may be revised, and as the Police Charges are to be borne by Government, if any larger establishment be required than has been maintained when the Zemindary was under the

Rs	as
481	8
309	-
172	8

Court

13

Court of Wards the causes of such increase should be carefully explained.

Revᵘᵉ Bᵈ Office,
Fort Sᵗ George,
2ᵈ April, 1846

Despᵈ 7 D
Recᵈ 10ᵗʰ JB

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant

[signature]
Secretary

To J. Blackburne Esqʳᵉ
Princˡ Collʳ of Madura.

Compᵈ [signature]

Received 23 May 1846

Revenue Department

Extract from the Proceedings of the Board of Revenue dated, 14th May, 1846.

10th April 1846. Read letter from the Principal Collector of Madura submitting for the consideration and orders of the Board copy of a communication proposed to be returned to an address presented to him by Ranee Purvatha Virdhanee Nachyar the mother of the late minor Heiress of Ramnad on the subject of a decision of the Subordinate Court of Madura modifying an award given in 1834 by himself as umpire in a boundary dispute respecting certain lands then decreed to be made over entirely to the Ramnad Zemindary.

(Here enter No. 83.)

Under the circumstances in which the present reference is brought to notice, and in

in the absence of the Courts' Proceedings ad:
:judging an equal division of the land in
question to the two Zemindaries of Ottiapoorum
and Ramnad in modification of the previous
amicable award, there seems to be no ob:
objection to the course proposed to be
adopted by the Principal Collector, the
Board accordingly approve of such portion
of the answer submitted with the foregoing
letter as informs the Ranee that she should
bring her grievances, by motion, to the notice
of the Civil Judge, and be guided by the
Courts' opinion, or if dissatisfied with it,
that she should bring it to the notice of
the Sudr Udalut, detailing all the reasons
for dissatisfaction with the Courts' late
decree." the Principal Collector may at
the same time inform the Ranee that he
will be prepared to furnish her with
copies of the original umpirage award
passed

141

passed by himself on the occasion of his adjusting the dispute in the year 1834, as well as of the mutual agreement stated to have been entered into by both Parties to abide by his decision of the question then at issue between them, as well also as of any other documents which may be forthcoming from his records calculated to support the justice of the present claim.-

(A true Extract,)

[illegible]
Secretary

Despd 19 May 1846
Recd 23 [illegible]

Compd. [illegible]

Received 15th October 1846 / R.

Revenue Department.

143

Extract from the Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 5th October 1846.

Read letter from the Principal Collector of Madura dated 22nd September 1846, reporting the payment by order of the Ranee of Ramnad of Rupees 49,734:9:6, the property of that Estate, to Mr. Fischer of Salem.

(Here enter No. 208)

Para 1. The sum reported by the Principal Collector of Madura in the letter above recorded as having been paid by him under order from the Ranee to Mr. Fischer of Salem is the amount (within a trifling sum) as specified in the Razeenamah executed on the 21st October 1842 between Mr. Fischer and the present Ranee, at

Actual Amount ...zeenamah Rs ...0,128:13:2

Principal Col. 26th July 1844.

that time Guardian to the late Ranee her daughter, in Suit No. 11 of 1841 on the file of the Southern Provincial Court. This suit was instituted by Mr. Fischer against the present Ranee Purvatha Verdaney Natchyar, Guardian to her daughter Vararajah Natchyar at that time minor heiress of the Ramnad Estate, as 1st Defendant, and Moottoo Chella Taver the Manager of the Zemindary as 2nd Defendant, for the purpose of recovering the amount stated to be due to him, for his alleged Services in procuring the refund of the Ramnad Moturpha, and in virtue of a Karar or letter of Agreement given to him by the 2nd Defendant the Manager of the Estate under date 8th July 1839.

From Government 16th June 1844.

The Honorable the Court of Directors in their Despatch of the 2nd April 1844, when reviewing the Proceedings of the late Madura Commission state (Para 16) "Of "Mr. Fischer's conduct in prosecuting a "claim to remuneration for the pretended "exertion of his influence in obtain-"ing a settlement of the claim to "Mohturpha remission on the part of "the Ramnad Zemindar, we are not "called on to express an opinion, "but we desire to be informed of "the result of the Suit which Mr. "Fischer instituted against the "late Manager of the Ramnad Zemindary." In the same Despatch the Home Government strongly condemned the manner in which Mr. Fischer had been allowed to interfere in the

affairs of the Madura District.
and they fully approve the orders
of the Local Government, under
which Mr Blackburne's restoration
to Office, has been coupled with
an explicit warning "against any
"repetition of disobedience to superior
"authority on any occasion whatever,
"or any instance of permitting Mr
"Fischer or his Servants to exercise
"any influence or interference in the
"affairs of the District."–

2. With reference to the 16th Para
of the Despatch above quoted, the letter
from the Principal Collector 26th July 1844,
notifying the execution of the Razeenamah
in the suit brought by Mr Fischer
and a further communication from
the same Officer 22nd August 1844
stating

stating, in reply to a reference on the question, that the amount of the Razeenamah had not been paid, nor application made for it, were laid before Government by the Board with their Acting Secretary's letter of 27th August 1844.

In their General letter of

3

From Govt. 19th July 1845.

23d April 1845 (Para 10) the Court of Directors again adverted to the subject, and expressed "their desire that the "Collector of Madura should be "specially directed to report to the "Board of Revenue, whether Mr Fischer "had effected any private arrangement "with the Guardian of the Ramnad "Zemindar, for the liquidation of his "claim under the Razeenamah executed "by the Rannee in the Suit No. 11 of "1841 instituted against the late Manager "of this Zemindary." The Board in conformity with the orders of Government

Extract

Extract Minutes Consultation 19th July 1845, Para 4, called upon Mr Blackburne for information upon the point, and he in reply stated, "that Mr Fischer had effected "no private arrangement with the late or "present Guardian of the Ramnad Minor "heirs for liquidation of his claim under "the Razeenamah executed in Suit No 11 "of 1841" he added "that in his opinion, that "agreement was unnecessary, and that the "money would be paid as soon as the parties "were at liberty to follow their own inclina-"tions" This letter was submitted by the Board to Government 25th September 1845.

From Pl Colle[ctor]
8th Sept 18[45]

4. In his letter of 9th May 1846, the Principal Collector in forwarding copy of the proceedings of the Court of Sudr Udawlut, 20th April 1846 whereby "the orders of the lower Court for the continuance of the Ramnad Zemindary

under

under sequestration were cancelled, and in advising the release of the property to the Raunee Purvatha Vurdaney Natchyar," reminded the Board of the "claim of Mr. Fischer of Salem on the "lady into whose hands he had recommend"-ed surrender of the Estate." On this passage the Board in their Proceedings

Para 5 of 21st May 1846 remarked as follows - "In "the last para of his letter now under "review the Principal Collector reminds "the Board of the claim of Mr. Fischer "upon Purvatha Vurdaney Natchyar "in virtue of the Rauzeenamah filed in "suit No. 11 of 1841 - In his previous letter "of 8th September 1845 he has given it "as his opinion that the money would "be paid as soon as the parties are at "liberty to follow their own inclinations." "The Board have no means of knowing how

"how far this impression may be well
"founded: but it appears to them that
"the question is one in which the
Revenue Authorities have no power
of interference, and which must be
left to be settled by the parties among
"themselves, or by reference to a Civil
"Tribunal. If the Plaintiff in No. 3
"of 1823, Moottoo Veerayee Natcheyar,
"has reason to apprehend that by making
"this payment to Mr. Fischer, or by any
"other means, Purvatha Vurdaney Natcheyar
"will, on entering upon possession of the
"Estate, misappropriate its resources, she
"may, as intimated by the Sudr Adalut,
"apply to the Court, in order that legal
"measures may be made available for the
"protection of the property, and it will be
"for that authority to take such steps
"as may seem called for."

The

The views of the Board seem to have receiv[ed]
the approval and sanction of Government
16th June 1846.

No 635 of 1846. 5. About the same time a Petition
was addressed to this Office by Moottoo
Veroye Natcheyar Plaintiff in the suit
No 3 of 1843 brought for recovery of the
Ramnad Estate, in which she deprecate[d]
surrender of the property to Purwatha
Vurdana Natcheyar on the ground that
the latter would misapply its resources,
and alluded particularly to Mr Fischer's
claim. On this Petition the Board

[Proc]eedings 21st [M]ay 1846. passed the following Endorsement. "The
"question of the surrender of the Ram:
"nad Zemindary to Purwatha Vurdana
"Natchyar has been submitted for
"the orders of Government. Petitioner

may

"may inform herself of any instructions
"which may be given on the subject by
"application from time to time to the
"Principal Collector of Madura. If
"on Purwatha Vurdana Natcheyar being
"placed in possession of the property,
"she attempt to misappropriate its re-
"sources by making payment to Mr.
"Fischer of the alleged sum of 56,000 Rupees
"or by any other means. Petitioner may
"address the Civil Court."

6. Copies of all these papers were duly furnished to the Principal Collector, and on their receipt Mr. Blackburne in a letter of 10th June last states that, looking upon the debt (without "reference to its being or not being excessive) "due by Ranee Purwatha Vurdana "Natcheyar of Ramnad to Mr. Fischer of Salem

"Salari as just, and for very important
"services performed, he would have encourag
"her immediate payment of it, if he had
"not been made aware of the Board's senti-
"ments by the proceedings of the 21st May,"
and he added that when "he considered
"the heavy punishment with which the
"Board threaten Purwatha Verdana &
"Natchyar, at the hands of the Civil
"Courts, if she should presume to pay
"what he has already reported her to
"believe a true and honest debt, as
"well as her intention honestly to
"discharge it - and when he considered
"their Endorsement of the 21st Ultimo
"on Petition No. 635 of 1846; in which
"they encouraged her adversary Moottoo
"Veerayee Natchyar to address herself

to

to the Civil Courts to enforce the
"Board's expectations, he could but
"request permission to furnish her
"with a copy of that Part of the
"Board's Proceedings, as also copy of
"their Endorsement on Petition No. 635 of
"1846, to guard her if possible from
"the evils they think she will incur
"by following the present dictates of her
"heart and mind." The Board saw
no reason to comply with the
Principal Collector's request to
be allowed to furnish Copies
of the Papers in question, to
Perumatha Virdanah Natchyar,
both because those papers were not intended
to bear the construction which
Mr.

Mr Blackburne had placed upon them, a because such a measure was unusual and seemed to them to be uncalled for, and they intimated their refusal to the Principal Collector in their order of 13th July, 1846.

On the 1st July 1846, the Principal Collector addressed the Board informing them that "orders were being "issued for transfer of the Ramnad Zemin-"dary to the Ranee Purvatha Vurdanee Na-"chyar", on the 21st of the same month he reported "that Narasing Row Salt "Amildar doing the duty of Manager of "Ramnad delivered over charge of the balance "of Cash in hand amounting to Rupees "21,624:14:10, together with Jewels, Chanks, "Chayroot and other Articles, property of "the Zemindary, to Ranee Purvathee Vur-"danee Nachyar, as per four receipts taken "from her". From this letter the Board were led to suppose that the Zemindary had

been

was surrendered to the Ranee in toto,
and they stated the same in their
letter to Government of 27th August
last Para 1. In the letter rec'd at
the head of these Proceedings the Prin-
cipal Collector states, "in reference to his
"seven months suspension from the end
"of 1842 to the middle of 1843" that he
has just paid under order of the Ranee
" " " of Ramnad Rupees
"49,734:9:6 of her money in his hands to
"Mr. Fischer of Salem".

8. The Board of Revenue deem
it their duty at once to lay Mr Black-
burne's letter before the Most Noble the
Governor in Council for his consideration
and orders, with the [illegible] as above
given of all the previous correspondence
connected with the subject. They resolve
also to call upon the Principal Col-
lector of Madura to furnish as early as
possible

15

possible with a view to it's being sub-
-mitted to Government, explanation as
to whether the Ramnad Zemindary
has or has not been made over to the
Ranee, as to the source whence the money
paid to Mr Fischer was derived, and
especially, in reference to the correspond-
-ence quoted in the preceding paras as
to the circumstances and the authority
under which he has paid, or taken part
in the payment of, the sum in question
to that Individual.-

Ordered that copy of the fore-
-going Extract from the Board's Proceedings
be submitted to Government, and a dupli-
-cate of the same be furnished to the
Principal Collector of Madura.-

(A true Extract)

Wycroft
Secretary

Despd 7 October 1846
Recd 15th do

Comp. Lambert

2/1/85

7/5/85